

**January 17, 2002**

Meeting notes from the Archaeological Resources Issue Team meeting of Jan. 16, 2002 held at the Redmond Library.

Issue team members in attendance were Ron Gregory and Susan Gray.

Notes taken by Ron Gregory

**Agenda Items:**

- 1) Role of Facilitator
  - 2) Ground Rules
  - 3) Refine Issue Description
  - 4) Open Public Forum
  - 5) Future Meetings
- 
- 1) Role of Facilitator: Since it is unlikely that the individual hired to facilitate issue team meetings will be present at many of the archaeological resource issue meetings, a need arose for an alternative to facilitate those meeting. The team agreed that Ron Gregory, BLM issue team lead, would facilitate meetings and that the facilitator role would include, but not necessarily be limited to: Clarifying objectives, ensuring full participation, keeping team members on track and on time with agenda items, ensuring commitments to action, and recapping agenda items.
  - 2) Ground Rules: Since the opportunity did not arise at the initial issue team meeting to discuss and develop a set of ground rules that would guide the actions of team members, we revisited that agenda item at the Jan. 16, 2001 meeting. Issue team members agreed that some of the ground rules that suggested on a hand-out were acceptable, some were not, and others need to be added. As a result of our discussion the team agreed to the following set of ground rules:
    - ✂ Be on time/start on time.
    - ✂ Notify the team lead in advance when unable to arrive on time or be present for meeting.
    - ✂ If team members don't show for meetings, the team will move forward with decision agreements without you (at the time the issue team members who were present were discussing this ground rule, the team member representing the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs called. We asked her opinion about the rule and see was in agreement that the rule should stand).
    - ✂ Turn off cell phones.
    - ✂ Disclose personal agendas.
    - ✂ Allow for a safe environment to express ideas, opinions, values, personal agendas, etc.
    - ✂ One conversation at a time/no side conversations.
    - ✂ Keep an open mind and respect other points of view.
    - ✂ Speak freely.
    - ✂ Take breaks as needed.
    - ✂ Set time limits and follow them.

### Ground rules/Archaeological Resources (continued)

- ✂ State what you mean—clearly.
- ✂ OK to call “rabbit trail”.
- ✂ Talk to, not about and Listen.
- ✂ Public comment limited to the end of meeting.
- ✂ You are responsible for the success of the meeting.

- 3) Refine Issue Description: The team compared the archaeological resource issue from the AMS against the one mailed to issue team members on January 7, 2002. We then reviewed the evolution of issue format styles as represented by the Jan. 7 archaeological issue, the example developed by Bill Dean, and the apparent preferred format style as developed by Phil Paterno. From that review, the following archaeological issue description was drafted:

The Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan established goals for the management of archaeological resources following the regulatory direction found in the National Historic Preservation Act, 36 CFR 800, and Executive Order 11593.

Those broad decisions did not take into account proactive management methods for “at risk”, significant archaeological resources within the planning area. Significant archaeological resources are becoming increasingly “at risk” due to the effect of urban development, dispersed recreation, artifact collection and acts of vandalism, as well as from the effects of natural deterioration. In order to manage those significant resources in a proactive manner, as required by law, the following needs assessment has been determined.

- 1) Identify “at risk”, significant archaeological resources within the Upper Deschutes Planning area.
- 2) Develop a criteria by which to determine the relative risk factors to known, and as yet undocumented, significant archaeological resources that exist across the planning area.
- 3) Prioritize the treatment, protection, preservation, and interpretation of “at risk” significant archaeological resources.
- 4) Determine mitigation measures that will diminish adverse effects to “at risk”, significant archeological resources.

After further consideration and discussion, the issue team agreed that the numbered items were action oriented and, therefore, did not constitute part of the issue description. Given that consideration the issue description was modified to read as follows:

The Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan established goals for the management of archaeological resources following the regulatory direction found in the National Historic Preservation Act, 36 CFR 800, and Executive Order 11593. Those broad decisions did not take into account proactive management methods for “at risk”, significant archaeological resources

Refine Issue Description (**Continued**)

within the planning area. Significant archaeological resources are becoming increasingly “at risk” due to the effect of urban development, dispersed recreation, artifact collection and acts of vandalism, as well as from the effects of natural deterioration.

Susan Gray said she would take the numbered items to see if she could work them into a scoring model for some future part of the planning process.

- 4) Open Public Form: No members of the public attended the meeting.
- 5) Future Meetings: Future archaeological resources issue team meetings will be held at the Redmond Library in the Historical Room, from 1-4 on the following dates:
  - Feb. 6, 2002
  - Feb. 20, 2002
  - Mar. 6, 2002
  - Mar. 20, 2002

(The team lead will have to contact other team member to reschedule the Feb. 20 meeting as it conflicts with a BLM NEPA training session scheduled for the same time).

The issue team lead also brought to the attention of team members present at the meeting that agreements and recommendations made by the team for inclusion in the plan were not necessarily something etched in stone. That those recommendations and contributions were subject to editing and modification as they passed through various review processes by the Provincial Advisory Committee, and the BLM State and Washington Offices.